

healthy, and more economically secure; and they are pointing the way for the Federal Government to follow their lead.

My congratulations to the foundation; and I look forward to working on their innovations, integrating them with U.S. Government policy around the globe.

WHY THE F/A-22 RAPTOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the opportunity to visit Langley Air Force Base in Virginia and spend time with the commander of the Air Combat Command, Lieutenant General William Fraser, and many dedicated, indeed dedicated, members of the United States Air Force. As part of the Air Force Caucus trip, we had almost 50 people participating in the trip.

Much of this trip focused on the F/A-22 Raptor and its importance to the future of the United States Air Force. After visiting with General Fraser and seeing the Raptor up close, I am more convinced and I think the participants who went on this trip are also convinced that the F/A-22 will become an integral part of future military successes.

Mr. Speaker, during my visit I was briefed not only about the warfighting capabilities of this plane but about the maintenance program as well. The Air Force uses cutting-edge technology to maintain this plane; and this, of course, leads to more efficient maintenance. It is the first jet to use an entirely paperless maintenance program, allowing new parts to be ordered or changes to be made significantly faster.

The engine also utilizes new technologies. Its design allows it to be worked on while still on the plane, that is, the engine. In the past, engines often needed to be removed in order to be maintained. This is not the case for the F/A-22. These new technologies mean less time in the shop and, of course, more time in the air.

Also, the maintenance training program has been improved. No longer are there these big, bulky maintenance manuals. The training is digital in real-time, with real-world conditions. It leads to more effective and efficient training. Maintainers spend less time in training and more time actually working on the plane. This, of course, leads to faster maintenance and thus the F/A-22s are not grounded for longer than is necessary.

In the past, and particularly in the post-September 11 environment, homeland security has been our top priority here in Congress and our Nation. The F/A-22 plays a large role in protecting the homeland. According to the Air Force, 238 legacy fighters would be required and needed to protect this

homeland while only 150 F/A-22s would be needed.

The Bush administration unfortunately has proposed cutting \$10 billion from the F/A-22 program over the next 5 years, leaving enough to buy 183 of the 381 planes the Air Force says it needs. Simply put, in my judgment, this number is just not sufficient.

The Air Force will not be able to guarantee air superiority without a sufficient quantity of F/A-22s. The U.S. has not lost a soldier due to an air attack since 1952. The Air Force has made air superiority look so easy that we have begun to take it for granted, but maintaining this air dominance is not easy.

For now, the United States Air Force is the best trained, the best equipped in the world; but Russia, China, India have made huge strides in achieving parity, and, in some cases, have even surpassed U.S. capabilities.

Our current, but badly aging, fighters no longer enjoy technological or aerodynamic superiority when compared to the modern aircraft of potential adversaries. There have been some recent exercises pitting the F-15s, which the F/A-22 Raptor will replace, against one of Russia's primary export fighters, resulting in kill ratios favoring the SU-30.

In contrast, on a recent training mission where a single F/A-22 went against five F-15s, the Raptor killed all the F-15s within 3 minutes. Additionally, due to a lack of stealth assets, the ability of our aircraft to operate in environments where hostile threats exist is inadequate. The only way to address these shortcomings, which will only worsen, I tell my colleagues, is with sufficient numbers of the F/A-22 Raptor. We cannot fight tomorrow's war with yesterday's equipment.

That is why America needs the Raptor. With a variety of internal weapons, the Raptor can destroy or negate the most capable future threats: advance fighters; surface-to-air missile systems; and high-value, mobile ground targets.

The F/A-22's combination of speed, stealth, and integrated avionics bring unmatched capabilities to cope with the 21st-century threat environment. Air dominance gives the joint force freedom from attack, freedom to maneuver and, of course, freedom to succeed. No substitute exists for the F/A-22's unique capabilities.

With the international proliferation of sophisticated aircraft and air defense systems, U.S. fighters are losing their ability to leverage access for U.S. forces in hostile regions. The F/A-22 changes this equation with its revolutionary design and potent array of systems.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we need to fully fund the F/A-22 Raptor over the next 5 years.

ETHICS CHANGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Janu-

ary 4, 2005, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the year, the House has been conducting its business without an organized Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in place to investigate possible unethical behavior by Members of Congress. Republicans have tried to blame Democrats on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for this standoff, but the fact is they have nobody to blame but themselves.

At the beginning of this year, the Republican leadership went ahead and changed the way the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct does its business. In the past, whenever ethics changes were being considered, they were addressed in a bipartisan fashion, with both Democrats and Republicans at the table. That is the only way ethics reform can honestly be addressed, but the Republican leadership ignored that protocol and strong-armed enough of its Members into passing new and weakened ethics rules.

The American people need to understand that these new rules will allow either party, Democrat or Republican, to protect its own Members. Under the new Republican rules, if the majority of the committee cannot determine whether or not an investigation should proceed, after 45 days of receiving a complaint, the complaint would simply be dropped. No action would take place.

Since the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is made up of five Members from each party, either side could prevent an ethics investigation from moving forward against one of its Members. Now, this is not the way the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is supposed to work. Under the old bipartisan rules, if the committee could not come to an agreement on how to proceed after 45 days, an investigative subcommittee was created.

The weakening of the ethics rules by House Republicans did not fool editorial writers, both liberal and conservative, who follow House proceedings closely; and I just wanted to give some examples.

The conservative Chicago Tribune recently said, How do House Republicans respond to ethical lapses? By trying to bury them.

□ 1245

The Hartford Courant concluded, "The committee has been careening toward ethical oblivion in recent years, as the majority Republicans have relaxed the standards, eased up on investigations and created trapdoors through which alleged transgressors could escape."

The Republican leadership did not stop at just weakening the ethics rules, the Republican leadership also purged three Republican Members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, three Members who were not in the pockets of the leadership.

After losing his chairmanship of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) told *The Washington Post* that there is “a bad perception out there that there was a purge in the committee and that people were put in that would protect our side of the aisle better than I did. Nobody should be there to protect anybody. They should be there to protect the integrity of the institution.”

Mr. Speaker, congressional Republicans should listen to their former ethics chairman, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY). The integrity of the House of Representatives is much more important than any one Member.

These actions by the Republican majority really make one wonder why the changes are necessary now. It seems clear to me that the Republican leadership went to all of this trouble to protect one of its leaders. Last month the *Wall Street Journal*, which has a conservative editorial page, charged there is an “odor,” an “unsavory whiff” at the very highest reaches of this House. Every single day, it seems, more revelations come out about questionable actions by a member of the Republican leadership. These daily revelations should concern every Member of the institution.

My Democrat colleagues and I realize the integrity of the House is at stake. We cannot allow weakened ethics rules to move forward to protect anyone, and it is critical that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct be allowed to do its job and that is impossible under the new Republican rules.

Mr. Speaker, as the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said back in November 1995, “The time has come that the American people know exactly what their representatives are doing here in Washington, are they feeding at the public trough, taking lobbyist-paid vacations, getting wine and dined by special interest groups, or are they working hard to represent their constituents? The American people have a right to know.” That was the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), in his own words 10 years ago.

Let me say, the majority leader was right, the American people deserve answers and they will not get those answers under the weakened Republican ethics rules. That is why Democrats are fighting so hard to have the old rules restored. If the majority leader believes his comments from 10 years ago, I would think he would join us in our fight.

DISCRIMINATION AT THE UNITED NATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Georgia). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, we are currently engaged in a detailed and comprehensive review of the United Nations, the system it has, with the goal of providing reforms that are going to ensure transparency, accountability, and efficiency in all U.N. operations. A critical component of this effort must include measures to ensure that Israel is afforded equal treatment and representation while addressing the anti-Israeli and anti-Semitic component that is pervasive in many U.N. bodies and its affiliated agencies.

The 1975 United Nations resolution equating Zionism, the national liberation movement of the Jewish people, to racism stands out as an example of this bias and outright bigotry. While this was the most notorious illustration of its anti-Jewish sentiment at the U.N. there are many, many others.

During the 1991 session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, for example, the Syrian representative to the U.N. repeated the Damascus blood libel that Jews killed Christian children to use their blood to make Matzo. In 1997, the Palestinian representative charged that the Israeli Government had injected 300 Palestinian children with the HIV virus.

The goals of the 2001 U.N. World Conference Against Racism were undermined by hateful anti-Jewish rhetoric and anti-Israeli political agendas, prompting both Israel and the United States to withdraw their delegations from the conference.

In the United Nations General Assembly, we must look no further than the over 20 resolutions introduced by the Palestinian delegation each and every year against Israel, challenging Israel's policies and her very right to exist. During the 59th session of the U.N. General Assembly for 2004, close to 30 percent of all resolutions considered by this body were measures condemning Israel in some fashion.

At the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, there is an entire agenda item, item 8, that is dedicated to attacking and criticizing Israel. Countries that are gross human rights violators, such as Libya, Indonesia, and Egypt, have introduced resolutions under this category that criticize Israel for alleged human rights abuses in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

An additional resolution was introduced at this year's Human Rights Commission regarding what was termed as the Palestinian right of self-determination for the Palestinians, as well as another one on Israel and Lebanon. Yet there was not a single measure on the Syrian regime's gross violations of the rights of the Syrian and the Lebanese people or on the deplorable acts committed by the Iranian regime against its people.

Israel is a democracy and yet its sovereignty and its right to defend itself are frequently called into question in the United Nations system. The ruling last summer by the International Court of Justice on Israel's security

fence is a case in point. Not only was Israel's inherent right to self-defense branded illegitimate by the United Nations, but terrorists and suicide bombers remain uncensored.

In addition, the failure of the U.N. system in fulfilling its mandate is illustrated by the limitations placed on Israel's membership. Israel is denied the ability to serve or run for leadership positions in multiple U.N. bodies and its affiliated agencies. While Israel was accepted as a temporary member of the Western European and Others Group, it is not allowed to present candidacies for open seats in any U.N. body and is not able to compete for major U.N. bodies.

Israel is excluded from consultations at the U.N. offices in Geneva, Nairobi, Rome and Vienna. By contrast, there is a separate “U.N. Division For Palestinian Rights,” a “Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, a U.N. Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process and Personal Representative to the Palestinian Liberation Organization and the Palestinian Authority,” and “NGO Network on the Question of Palestine.”

There is also an entire agency, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, specifically designated for Palestinian refugees at a cost of over \$400 million in the year 2004, yet all other refugees and internally displaced persons throughout the world are covered by the Office of the U.N. High Commissioner For Refugees.

Mr. Speaker, I include the remainder of my statement for the RECORD, and close by saying any effort at reforming the United Nations must include an end to the anti-Israel and anti-Semitic sentiment that has infected the U.N. organization for far too long.

I held a hearing last week to evaluate United Nations programs related to the Middle East, with special emphasis on the anti-Israel discrimination and anti-Semitic attacks.

It became abundantly clear that any U.N. reform efforts must address this imbalance and bias in favor of rogue states and individual groups.

In turn, the discrimination against Israel in the United Nations must be brought to an immediate end.

I have undertaken various initiatives to correct this injustice and ensure full membership and participation for Israel in all U.N. forums.

Most recently, I introduced H. Res. 54: calling on the United Nations to hold countries accountable for anti-Semitic statements and anti-Israeli incitement and calling for U.N. entities, such as UNESCO, to develop and implement Holocaust education programs throughout the world as part of an effort to combat such religious intolerance and anti-Israeli bias.

I ask my colleagues to render their support to these efforts and to co-sponsor this resolution.

The goals enshrined in the U.N. Charter—the promotion of international peace and security, and the respect for fundamental human rights—have never been more significant for the Jewish people and the State of Israel, which was founded on the ashes of the Holocaust.